

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 95-7569

DANIEL JOHNSON WILLIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

NOLAN B. JONES, Chairman of Board of Commissioners; CHARLES BATTLE, JR., Commissioner; LESLIE D. STRAYHORN, Commissioner; SONDRIGGS, Commissioner; REYNOLDS MASON, Sheriff; TIM MORTON, Deputy; UNKNOWN DEPUTY; BILLY W. WHITE; HORACE PHILLIPS, Member of Commissioners; JONES COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 95-7754

DANIEL JOHNSON WILLIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

NOLAN B. JONES, Chairman of Board of Commissioners; CHARLES BATTLE, JR., Commissioner; LESLIE D. STRAYHORN, Commissioner; SONDRIGGS, Commissioner; REYNOLDS MASON, Sheriff; TIM MORTON, Deputy; UNKNOWN DEPUTY; BILLY W. WHITE; HORACE PHILLIPS, Member of Commissioners; JONES COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Greenville. James C. Fox, Chief District Judge. (CA-95-76)

Submitted: August 5, 1997

Decided: October 9, 1997

Before MURNAGHAN and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges, and PHILLIPS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Daniel Johnson Willis, Appellant Pro Se. Robert Scott Pierce, WOMBLE, CARLYLE, SANDRIDGE & RICE, Winston-Salem, North Carolina; Thomas Giles Meacham, Jr., OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NORTH CAROLINA, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Appellant appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (1994) complaint and order retaining the record in the district court. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and orders and find no reversible error. The claims Willis raises do not meet the constitutional standards required to state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (1994). The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Willis's motions to amend the caption and complaint. The district court properly retained the record while motions in the case were still pending. We deny Willis's motions for oral argument. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED